

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 14-40 are pending in the application. Claims 38-40 are newly added. No new matter is added.

The applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority documents, and for determining that the drawings are acceptable.

The Office action rejects claims 14-19 and 21-37 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Take et al. (USP 5,883,887, hereinafter Take) and Kanterakis (USP 6,389,056). The applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The combination of Take and Kanterakis fails to teach a wireless network that includes a terminal that transmits a first signaling sequence as an indication to use one of a plurality of contention channels, wherein the base station, upon receiving the first signaling sequence, broadcasts a provision message indicating a channel that is available to a plurality of terminals for contention-based access, as specifically claimed in independent claim 14. Each of the other independent claims includes a similar limitation.

Take teaches a base station that manages a plurality of contention channels, and, in response to a request by a terminal, assigns the channel to the terminal for uncontested use by the terminal. As illustrated in Take's FIG. 5, the terminal requests a channel for its use at S0101; the base station converts the status of a selected random access channel (RACH1) to be a telephone channel (TCH1) at S0105, and assigns the channel to the requesting terminal at S0106. That is, upon request of the terminal, the base station changes a random access channel into a dedicated point-to-point channel, which is contrary to the claimed indication that the channel is available for contention-based access. Kanterakis does not address a provision message that provides a channel for random access.

Because the combination of Take and Kanterakis does not teach or suggest each of the elements of the applicant's independent claims, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection of claims 14-19 and 21-37 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Take and Kanterakis.

The Office action rejects claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Take, Kanterakis, and Crichton et al. (USP 6,330,459, hereinafter Crichton).

Claim 20 is dependent upon claim 14, and in this rejection, the Office action relies upon Take and Kanterakis for teaching the elements of claim 14. Based on the remarks above, the applicant respectfully requests the Examiner's reconsideration of this rejection.

In view of the foregoing, the applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. McDermott/
Robert M. McDermott, Esq.
Registration Number 41,508
Phone: 804-493-0707
Fax: 215-243-7525

Please direct all correspondence to:
Larry Liberchuk, Esq.
Philips Intellectual Property and Standards
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
Phone: (914) 333-9618
Fax: (914) 332-0615